

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This case has been carefully reviewed and analyzed in view of the Official Action dated 17 November 2004. Responsive to the rejection made in the Official Action, Claims 1, and 18—21 have been amended to more clearly articulate and define the inventive concept of the present Subject Application device. No new material has been added.

The Examiner's acceptance of the drawings is noted with appreciation.

The Examiner rejected Claims 1 and 18—21 on the basis of 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Brusasco (U.S. 5,005,436). The Examiner notes that the Brusasco reference teaches “...*a plastic housing (18) enclosing said screw threaded nipple...*” Brusasco refers to item #18 as one of “...*two identical, connected bodies 18...*” which together constitute the “*U-shaped fastener 12...*” [Column 3, lines 36-38] and may be seen well illustrated in Brusasco's Figs. 3, 4 and 13. The currently amended Claim 1 provides for “...*a plastic material completely circumferentially enclosing said screw threaded nipple...*” It is respectfully believed by the Applicants that Brusasco's component #18 does not encircle the screw threaded nipple in the complete and circumferential manner disclosed and claimed in the currently amended subject Application Claims.

The Examiner further refers to item #4 of Brusasco as “*an elongated hole*,” which Brusasco describes item #4 as “...*a center hole*...” [Column 3, line 10]. The diagrams show Brusasco’s item #4 as a central bore hole in contradistinction to the present subject Application device’s ‘*elongated through recess* [15]’ that was referred to in the originally submitted Claims as “...*a long, elongated hole*...”

The Applicants respectfully believe that the Brusasco reference citation does not teach, claim or suggest either the fully and circumferentially encircling plastic housing or the elongated through recess, as are disclosed and claimed by the presently amended Claims of the subject Application system. Absent these two important elements of the currently amended base claim of the subject Application, it is believed that the Brusasco reference does not support the Examiner’s §102(b) rejection. Applicants are of the belief therefore that currently amended Claim 1 is patentably distinguishable from the device of the Brusasco reference cited as the basis for the §102(b) rejection, and therefore dependent Claims 18—21 are believed to be allowable as well, for at least the same reasons as above.

Applicants have reviewed the other references listed in the Official Action dated 17 November 2004, and believe them to be even further removed from the present Subject Application device than the reference cited by the Examiner in support of the §102(b) rejection.

App.No. 10/688,899

MR2723-173Div

Response to Office Action of 17 November 2004

It is therefore the Applicant's belief that the basis for the Examiner's rejection of Claims 1 and 18-21 has been overcome by the above amendments and remarks, and therefore, that the subject Patent Application has been placed in condition for allowance, which action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,  
(For: ROSENBERG, KLEIN & LEE)



Harry Sernaker  
Registration #50,595

Dated: 2-8-05

Suite #101  
3458 Ellicott Center Drive  
Ellicott City, MD 21043  
(410) 465-6678